

REMARKS

The Office Action of January 19, 2006, and the cited art have been carefully considered. The application has been amended to eliminate unnecessary limitations and to correct grammatical and similar errors. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested based on the amendments and following discussion.

REJECTION 112:

1. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for not having antecedent basis for "support frame".

The claim has been amended.

2. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for omitting essential structural connection, pointing in particular to "how axially extending crevices are capable of supporting the end portions of the support."

Claim 5 as amended reads, in part, "*wherein the base includes a rigid non-conducting body mechanically coupled to the reflector adjacent the base opening; the non-conducting body being formed with two or more axially extending crevices enclosing to brace at least end portions of the support* "

It is clear the base further includes "... *a rigid non-conducting body mechanically coupled to the reflector adjacent the base opening...*" The position and coupling are structurally defined. It is clear "*the non-conducting body*" is further "... *formed with two or more axially extending crevices*". The axial direction is clearly defined. An axially extending crevice is a clear mechanical description of a feature possessed by the rigid body. The crevices are described as enclosing at least end portions of the support. This also is a clear mechanical relation. End portions of the support are enclosed in the axial crevices. This enclosure is further mechanically limited in that end portions of the support are braced in the crevices. The rigid support, at least along the axial crevices approaches the support sufficiently to provide a brace to the support. This is a clear mechanical relationship. The Applicant believes there is a verbal description of a mechanical configuration linking and relating all claimed parts. No part is unlinked in relation to the other parts. Further, the claimed parts and relations are all clearly depicted in the figures. The Applicant believes the requirements of 112 second paragraph are met, and there is no basis for the rejection.

REJECTION 103:

2. Claims 1 - 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over combinations of Cooper, US 5,997,154; Mayer US 6,724,135; Haraden, US 5,254,901 and van Lier US 6,600,256.

Cooper '154 shows a metal reflector 32 formed with a ledge on the forwardmost edge. The ledge provides a support for a filter 26 that extends forward of the reflector body. A holder 28 holds this assembly together.

Cooper fails to show “...*a lens located entirely in the defined [reflector] cavity...*”

Cooper fails to show “...[the reflector cavity having] *the one or more projections and sealed along the lens to the interior surface*”.

Cooper fails to show “... *the lens being offset from the face opening sufficient that the whole of the lens is recessed from the face opening...*” and

Cooper fails to show this in the context of “*An electric lamp...[with] a threaded base providing electrical connection for the two or more electric leads and mechanical support for the support.*”

Cooper effectively shows flashlight with a detachable filter guarded by a holder. This in no way makes a threaded base lamp bulb with a sealed and fully recessed lens obvious. There is no suggestion in Cooper to form the support for the lens anywhere but on the forwardmost part of the reflector. There is no suggestion anywhere to fully recess the lens in the depth of the reflector, to seal it to the reflector in this deep position or to use the reflector lip as a guard for the lens. Looking at Cooper ones does not see a prescription of how to make threaded base lamp with a protected lens.

Mayer '135 shows a threaded base reflector lamp. The reflector shows the typical ledge formed at the forwardmost part of the reflector supporting a typical cover lens.

Mayer fails to show “...*a lens located entirely in the defined [reflector] cavity...*”

Mayer fails to show “...*the lens being offset from the face opening sufficient that the whole of the lens is recessed from the face opening...*” and

Mayer shows a common lamp structure with the lens and reflector joined at the front lip, just like every other sealed reflector lamp. This is typical of a jar with a top or a can with a lid. It is how everybody does it. There is no suggestion here to do anything different. Looking at Mayer there is no suggestion to recess the lens wholly within the body of the reflector to leave a protective lip surrounding the lens that acts as a light shield or guide shaping the projected beam and limiting the side view of the beam. Mayer does not excite anything but the old knowledge of sealing the lens and reflector the old way. Mayer does not make the claimed invention obvious.

Haraden '901 and Van Lier '256 mount their respective lenses on the forward edge of the reflectors and bow the lenses further forward. The two references then lead in the opposite direction by suggesting an externally mounted and externally directed lens. Neither reference shows, suggests or makes obvious a lamp with a lens fully recessed in the cavity of the reflector.

No combination of the references leads one to make a threaded base lamp with a fully recessed lens.

The rejection of Claims 1 – 16 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over any combination of Cooper US 5,997,154; Mayer US 6,724,135; Haraden US 5,254,901 and van Lier US 6,600,256 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is believed that a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made, that the Application as amended is patentably distinct over the cited art, and that the case is now in condition to be passed to issue. Reconsideration of the amended application is therefore requested, and an early favorable notice of allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *William E. Meyer*

William E. Meyer
Reg. No. 30,719
Attorney for Applicants

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
100 ENDICOTT STREET
DANVERS, MA 01923
(978) 750-2384
(978) 750-2045 FAX